

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CYMEYON HILL,

Plaintiff,

v.

N.R. KAY, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:21-cv-1297 DB P

ORDER

Plaintiff, a civil detainee proceeding pro se, has filed a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and an application to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

The federal venue statute provides that a civil action “may be brought in (1) a judicial district in which any defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the State in which the district is located, (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the subject of the action is situated, or (3) if there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought as provided in this action, any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the court’s personal jurisdiction with respect to such action.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

In this case, it appears that defendants are located and the claim arose in Monterey and/or San Mateo Counties. Those counties are in the Northern District of California. Therefore, plaintiff’s claim should have been filed in the United States District Court for the Northern

1 District of California. In the interest of justice, a federal court may transfer a complaint filed in
2 the wrong district to the correct district. See 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a); Starnes v. McGuire, 512 F.2d
3 918, 932 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

4 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the United
5 States District Court for the Northern District of California.

6 Dated: July 28, 2021

7
8 
9 DEBORAH BARNES
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
11
12
13
14

15 DLB:9
16 DB Prisoner Inbox/civil rights/R/hill1297.21a
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28